DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 333 VT 012 930

TITLE	Assessment of the Current Status of Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs.
INSTITUTION	California State Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Jan 71
NOTE	30p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Area Vocational Schools, Educational Finance, Program Development, *Program Effectiveness, Program Evaluation, *Regional Programs, *Regional Schools, State Boards of Education, State Legislation, *Vocational Training Centers
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

Because of a lack of acceptance of area vocational schools in the State, the California legislature passed broader legislation providing for regional occupational centers and regional occupational programs, with the responsibility for planning, operating, and financing the programs delegated to the county school superintendents in conjunction with the local districts. Although the occupational centers have been implemented successfully in areas lacking existing vocational programs, the trend has been toward regional occupational programs, with their lower cost resulting from greater utilization of existing facilities and personnel. In addition, they provide a broader education and are more closely related to the present high school concept, making them less susceptible to negative attitudes toward vocational education. Tentative guidelines and a listing of existing programs and centers are appended. (BH)

ED054333

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Assessment of the Current Status of Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs

January, 1971

CALIFORNIA ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
AND TECHNICAL TRAINING

1500 - 5th Street, Sacramento, California 95814
916/445-0698

VT012930

CALIFORNIA ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Members

Melvin L. Barlow
Truman Berg
Norman S. Blacher
James R. Blackwood
Mrs. Virna M. Canson
Richard M. Clowes
Manuel Correa
Mervyn M. Dymally
Oscar L. Gallego
Bill Greene
Harry A. Harrison
Herbert L. Martin
Allison J. McNay, Chairman
Robert P. Millslagle
Bruce K. Nestande
Mrs. Eleanore D. Nettle
Charles W. Patrick
Alfonso B. Perez
David Risling
J. Bryan Sullivan
F. Parker Wilber
John F. Williams

Staff: Karl W. Kolb, Executive Director
Dr. Harry W. Kerwin, Research and Evaluation Consultant
Miss Carol A. Monroe, Senior Stenographer
Mrs. Sandra M. Sturgeon, Stenographer II

Standing Committees

Executive
Finance
Personnel

Study Committees

Funding/Organization
Guidance and Counseling
Teacher Education
Vocational Education Programs

1500 - 5th Street, Sacramento, California 95814 916/445-0698

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	LEGISLATION	3
III.	FUNDING AND FUND ALLOCATIONS	7
IV.	IMPLEMENTATION POLICY CONTROL	10
V.	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	12
VI.	ROCs AND ROPs	13
VII.	CONCLUSIONS	15
VIII.	RECOMMENDATIONS	17
	APPENDICES	A & B

CALIFORNIA ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
AND TECHNICAL TRAINING

Assessment of the Current Status of Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs - January 1971

I. Introduction

This report presents an assessment of the current situation, as the Council sees it, in the Regional Occupational Centers, and Regional Occupational Programs. The report is intended to furnish a basis for comparison when the Council makes a later evaluation of the Regional Occupational Centers and Programs.

The concept of an area, or regional vocational school, or center designed to provide vocational programs by themselves is not new. This type of institution existed in California in the 1920's and 1930's.

On the whole California educators were not in favor of a separate institution for vocational education. There was a connotation of failure, a low prestige factor, and an obvious resentment on the part of many parents to have their children "sent down" to the vocational school.

Senate Bill 1379 in 1963 attempted to re-establish these types of area or regional vocational schools in California. However, the California educators did not want to become identified with the schools of the past. No school districts availed themselves of the provisions of the Act. There was a strong movement toward the"Comprehensive High School" approach.

The Legislature in recognition of the educators' attitude broadened the intent of the original legislation. In 1966 it passed new legislation establishing the Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs.

These Centers and Programs were placed under the supervision of the County Superintendents of Schools. The Superintendents had full responsibility for planning with the local districts on the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Centers and Programs, as well as providing funds through taxation. No federal funds are allocated to this program.

The legislation also provides that a school district having at least 500 schools may organize its own Regional Occupational Center or Program.

In 1969 legislation was passed requiring the State Board of Education to approve all programs. Heretofore only the approval of the County Boards of Education had been required. In addition, the State Board of Education was required to develop guidelines and criteria differentiating between courses appropriate for Centers and those appropriate for high schools.

From the outset of this activity there appears to have been some confusion on the interpretation of the intent of the legislation. There appears to be confusion concerning the tax program, i.e., can a district refuse to be taxed? Can children from a non-taxed district attend a Regional Occupational Center?

There is certainly disagreement on exactly how the funds derived from the tax can actually be utilized in the school programs. For instance, can an on-going vocational program be retitled and receive support from the new tax monies?

There are divisive opinions as to the relative value of the Regional Occupational Centers as compared to the Regional Occupational Programs. Proponents tend to strongly defend their positions.

There appears to be some confusion as to the exact role the State Board of Education is expected to play, and the role which the County Superintendents see for the State Board of Education.

Questions have been raised as to the legality of some of the current programs. In other words have certain programs been organized so as to not achieve the intent of the legislation but to bolster the regular school program?

The Programs Committee of the Council reviewed the present program approaches, interviewed California State Department of Education officials, county superintendents of schools, vocational coordinators, and interested citizens. Committee members have visited Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs to obtain first hand information.

Pertinent legislation was examined. Reports and other documents concerning these programs were studied. The comments reported below are based upon the available data.

II. Legislation

It seems quite clear that legislation from 1963 to the present intended to develop vocational education programs and to make them available to everyone who wanted to participate and who could benefit from the instruction. In fact the intent appears to be an extension of vocational education programs so as to make them available to a greater number of people.

Assurance is provided in the legislation so that the geographical location of students will not prevent them from participating in vocational education programs--transportation may be provided for them. The legislation also assures every high school student, graduate, out-of-school youth, and adult, that they will receive the necessary generalized and specific skill training to prepare them for employment.

Education Code Sections 7450-7471, emphasize the fact that the programs in the Regional Occupational Centers will be flexible. They emphasize that the curriculum will be broadened in technical subjects and efforts will be made to avoid duplication of training courses and expensive training equipment. It is further emphasized that rapid program adjustments will be made to meet changing needs as they arise.

The legislation recognizes that Regional Occupational Programs are feasible. It is stated that a great deal of flexibility may be obtained in planning and in the scope of operation as well as in utilizing a variety of physical training facilities at various training locations.

The legislation mentions that "qualified" students are the ones for whom they wish to offer training and educational opportunities. The immediate question then arises as to the definition of the word "qualified". This does imply a selection process. There are some instances where enrollment in a Regional Center or Program is based upon proven performance in regular vocational classes. In the above circumstances is the intent of the total program really being carried out with reference to accessibility of skill training to all persons wanting and needing

training for employment? Under 7455 (Education Code), Admission of Students, there is a clearer delineation of the word "qualified". All students, adults and minors must be able to benefit from the instruction and be approved on this basis by the county superintendent of schools, or governing board of the district or districts. It still involves selection by someone.

While the legislation speaks of broadened and flexible curricula, and flexible operations approach it is very specific on the program expected to be carried out in the Centers and Programs. The legislation says clearly that the vocational and occupational instruction provided in the Centers and Programs must be related to the attainment of a specific skill which will make the trainee technically equipped to be immediately employable in that skill upon completion of the training program. To guarantee this the legislation requires that only qualified teachers may teach in a Center or on a Program. The above requirements would appear to negate any approach to broad-based exploratory courses as a means of vocational counseling in the Centers or Programs.

The review developed the fact that this latter item is a matter of concern in some districts. There is a feeling that an exploratory phase is economically and educationally sound. However, this does not seem to be the intent of the legislation.

The legislation does provide for the establishment and conduct of Saturday vocational classes as well as evening full-time and part-time vocational education programs for minors and adults the year around. This is a significant approach. Records do not show many classes in operation under this arrangement.

Investigation has disclosed an interesting fact on enrollment in the Regional Occupational Centers. Adult enrollment tends to be a little more than half of the total enrollments.

Sheltered workshops designed to provide supervised industrial training for physically handicapped and mentally retarded minors may be established and conducted within the vocational training programs in the Centers in the Regional Occupational Programs. None of these types of workshops have been established as far as this review could determine.

Legislation is provided so as to apparently protect the student in a Center or Program from being considered as being in an inferior status through his association with this program of training. His diploma, certificate or other documents will not indicate that he was placed in this training program because of the quality, or lack of quality, of his intellectual or mental capacity. Does this imply that it is expected that the greater number of students in the Centers and Programs will be of low level intellectual and mental capacity, and therefore must be protected? However, the obvious assumption is that the effort is to keep the Centers and Programs identified as regular school programs.

There must be an annual evaluation by the Department of Education. This evaluation is made to the Legislature. The analysis requested is detailed and informative.

The Vocational Education Section of the State Department of Education is presently conducting a survey of Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs. A committee of county superintendents is also evaluating these programs and studying the funding and financial problems involved in the programs. The California Advisory Council on Vocational Education

will review these reports when they are available. It is expected that the Vocational Education Section of the State Department of Education will send out very soon a list of criteria and guidelines for the Centers and Programs.

III. Funding and Fund Allocations

As of the present time no federal funds are available for the Regional Occupational Centers or Programs. Funds must come from the local districts. These are secured through the county superintendents' office. He has the authority and privilege of levying a tax on county school districts. He decides, with the county board of education and the local school boards, the amount of money to be raised by taxes in order to develop, operate, and maintain a Regional Occupational Center or Program.

The maximum limits on a district tax for program development and operation is ten cents on each one hundred dollars of assessed valuation. The maximum rate for acquisition of land and buildings, or to pay rent for these facilities, is five cents for each one hundred dollars of assessed valuation. This makes a total maximum of fifteen cents.

The legislation states that the county superintendent of schools, or governing board of a school district, or districts maintaining a Regional Occupational Center(s) or Programs(s) may accept and expend grants from the Federal Government. This also applies to other public or private sources.

When students are sent to another administrative center for vocational classes an additional a.d.a. may be collected at their home school.

It requires, under Education Code 7462, 180 minutes for a minimum day in a Regional Occupation Center. Under the same code it only requires sixty minutes for a minimum day in a Regional Occupational Program. Two hundred forty minutes are required for the regular minimum day in attendance. The a.d.a. may be collected at the home school, and the Centers and Programs on a full or part-time basis.

Apparently the county superintendents' offices, in most cases, receive the a.d.a. generated from the off-campus (ROC-ROP) programs. These funds are then used to support the above programs.

With reference to the a.d.a., reports indicate that, in most cases, all travel time of students to and from vocational classes in other administrative centers is done on the students' time. No a.d.a. is credited for travel time. Reports from some areas indicate a difference of opinion on this also.

The intent of the legislation on funding seems quite clear. District taxes as needed may be levied, within certain limits, to acquire, build, or rent facilities and to carry on specific programs of vocational education. These taxes are to be collected under certain procedures.

The allocation and utilization of these funds would appear, on the surface at least, to be relatively concise and orderly. However, this does not seem to be the case. It is precisely at this point that considerable confusion exists and strong opposing positions are taken as to whether or not certain uses of funds are unwise and/or illegal.

The legislation on fund allocation and utilization appears to be unclear. There are wide variations in the type and scope of each of the county programs. County counsels have been asked for their interpretations of what the legislation seems to mean. Opinions of the Counsels appear to have wide variations also, particularly as individual district needs vary.

A strong feeling exists that since the funds were raised through district taxes they may be spent at the discretion of the school district. A feeling of resentment exists concerning possible outside interference in their programs. There is some feeling that the "end justifies the means" and that these funds may be justifiably used in general support of educational programs. For instance, according to reports, many on-going vocational programs were transferred to the ROC program and funds under this legislation were solicited for direct support. It is also reported that in some instances academic classes benefited from the new funds. These uses of the particular funds do not appear to meet the basic intent of the legislation.

The records show, however, that in some districts a significant number of students are now in some form of vocational education who would not have been there if the tax funds had not been available. While this is good it must be done within certain guidelines.

It was mentioned earlier in this report that no federal funds per se were directly allocated to the ROC/ROP programs. This is true. However, vocational funds received by the state from federal sources may possibly be used to support coordination services. When the services of a coordinator are devoted largely to a ROC or ROP program federal funds are, in a sense, being used.

In some instances it has been reported that some a.d.a. funds collected under a ROC program are being used to pay for vocational counseling services in some comprehensive high schools. By one interpretation this is to support the ROC/ROP programs by specific vocational counseling and therefore justified. By another interpretation this support is actually general support and therefore is, in effect, illegal according to the intent of the legislation.

This whole problem is currently under study in committees organized by the Vocational Education Section of the State Department of Education and county superintendents. Eventually an opinion from the Attorney General's office will be solicited. However, there seems to be a strong feeling that more preliminary work needs to be done before an official edict is handed down. It is feared that unnecessarially restrictive legislation may be the result.

There is a strong feeling among county superintendents that there should be federal funds specifically allocated to the ROC/ ROP program. In fact many would like to have all vocational education classes reclassified and included under these programs. This is apparently not acceptable to the State Board of Education.

In the Council's opinion there still is another unanswered question. That is, shouldn't the people in the local district actually vote on the tax to be imposed?

IV. Implementation Policy Control

Reports indicate that this is a sensitive area. As stated earlier the initial ROC/ROP programs were completely under the county school superintendents. They, with their boards of education,

county supervisors, and local citizens, developed plans, established programs, levied, and collected taxes. These taxes and generated a.d.a.'s were then distributed to school districts for their uses. In most cases these funds were used as the school district thought most necessary.

Apparently the Legislature recognized an inherent weakness in this approach and required that the State Board of Education develop guidelines and standards for these programs, and approve the establishment of ROC/ROP programs. The State Board of Education therefore finds itself in the position of supervising purely local programs, financed by local funds and supported by the local people.

Education Code Section 7451.7 states that the curriculum in the ROC/ROP programs must be subject to the approval of the Department (State Department of Education Vocational Section). It also specifies that these programs must comply with all of the requirements and standards as set forth in the State Plan for Vocational Education. This section further stipulates that the State Board of Education must adopt rules and regulations establishing guidelines and criteria for differentiating between courses appropriate for Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs, and those courses appropriate for high schools.

This section of the Code has created resentment and charges of unnecessary and unwarranted interference among some of the educators. The State Board of Education staff recognizes the importance of and necessity for a certain amount of supervision to guarantee observance of regulations leading to successful programs. However, the staff does not want to feel that it has been placed in the position of a policeman. It does, however,

feel that it has a legal responsibility to establish some rather broad guidelines and criteria for program establishment, implementation, and development. A considerable amount of initiative and responsibility, coupled with authority would be left to the local districts.

However, there is a persistent feeling that since no vocational education funds are involved the programs should not have to conform to regulations which are based on receipt of vocational funds. Local autonomy becomes a point of issue.

Early in the Spring of 1970 a statewide committee was named to study the total problems of the ROC/ROP program and make recommendations to the State Department of Education regarding the writing of the guidelines and criteria for the State Board of Education. The guidelines are included as Appendix A. These are in the process of being sent out by the Vocational Section of the California State Department of Education.

V. Community Colleges

Many California educators are concerned that the community colleges do not seem to have a significant role in the actual implementation of Regional Occupational Programs, or in serving as a Regional Occupational Center. Community colleges are, to some extent, involved in programs under the Manpower Development Training Act. Five thousand selected high school students in addition are attending academic classes in community colleges under the Veysey Bill (AB 2364).

At this point in time the operation and management of Centers and Programs are the concern of the county superintendents and county boards of education. The local districts are involved in

planning and in the taxation program to support the program. To date the Centers and Programs appear to be largely concerned with the high schools rather than the community colleges.

However, some community colleges are offering programs under the Regional Occupational Program. As will be discussed later, many educators are disturbed because it appears in some instances that all available resources are not being utilized with reference to the possible contributions of the community colleges. This concern is particularly pertinent when consideration may be given to constructing and equipping a completely new independent facility such as a Regional Occupational Center.

VI. ROCs and ROPs

This section presents a few of the strong viewpoints concerning ROCs and ROPs. The major issues which tend to challenge the concept of the Regional Occupational Center are: leading to costly and unnecessary duplication of resources and facilities; too time consuming and limited; too specific in training in trade skills; may be too much emphasis on achieving journeyman skills rather than job entry skills; in direct conflict with the concept of the comprehensive high schools; and identifies students in the Centers as "losers".

Independent vocational schools per se have not been acceptable in California in the past. The new title i.e., Regional Occupational Center, cannot guarantee success.

On the other hand the Regional Occupational Center may well fill a significant void in an area where there may be several high schools but no vocational education programs available. A Center can well contain the necessary shops, auxiliary classrooms,

and ancillary services to provide vocational education to a large number of students at one time. Many high schools would each furnish small groups of students with scattered interest. Brought together in one location the Center could fulfill its purpose.

The prestige factor of a Regional Occupational Center could be positive. It does not have to be negative as some educators apparently fear. The students' home school still provides him with an identity and activities. The Center is his solid hold on reality. Its program offers him a key to a job, pride and confidence. The administration and staff of any Center will play dynamic key roles in morale and image building.

There are successful ROCs now in operation. A review will be made later by the Council on program effectiveness.

In general, and as of this date, the Regional Occupational Program seems to have more proponents than Centers per se.

A few of the major points in favor of the ROP are: costs less; utilizes existing facilities; utilizes existing administration and staff; program may offer a broader base of job-entry preparation than a Center; vocational students may be in a ROP without being branded or identified negatively; the ROP is closely akin to the present high school concept; and the ROP provides an opportunity for exploratory, pre-vocational opportunities.

There are some possible problems in a Regional Occupational Program. It may well be that: School A has an outstanding auto mechanics program; School B has an excellent building trades class; School C has an outstanding machine shop and welding program; and School D has an excellent electronics program. No one school offers all of these courses. Therefore, it seems expedient and

wise to bus students between schools so that all students may enroll in a program of their choice.

However, since these programs are so good, the students at each school fill the classes. So no one can move. The alternative is after school classes, weekend, and holiday classes.

The Council feels that this latter effort should be implemented in any case. It makes no difference whether it is a ROC, or ROP or a comprehensive high school program all facilities should be used full time day and night.

The attached list of Regional Occupational Centers, and Regional Occupational Programs was current as of June 1970. See Appendix B.

VII. Conclusions

The concept of an area or regional vocational school is not new. California has tried them and found that the schools did not fully meet the needs of the students or community. However, the concept of the Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs seems to be receiving favorable reception, and implementation is proceeding. At the present time there seems to be a trend towards the ROP rather than the ROC.

The earlier legislation on ROCs/ROPs gave full responsibility to the county superintendents of schools for planning, taxing, allocation of funds, and for program implementation supervision. The legislature now requires that the State Board of Education, and the Vocational Education Section of the California State Department of Education be concerned with and involved in program and course approval.

This has caused some concern on the part of the local people, and county school superintendents who feel there may be unwarranted invasion of local level prerogative. Neither the State Board of Education nor the Vocational Education Section want to be placed in a policing position.

There appears to be confusion on the ultimate use of the local tax funds raised to support the ROCs and ROPs. Because of the wide and varied disparities of local situations in the different counties many and apparently diversified opinions are extant on the use of tax funds, and program implementation.

County counsel opinions have been obtained, and programs organized accordingly. In spite of obviously everyone's concern for legal approaches, questions have been raised as to the actual legality of some programs in view of the stated legislation. Ultimately the attorney general's office will be asked for an opinion.

To date no federal funds have been allocated to the Regional Occupational Centers and Programs. Many of the county superintendents feel that federal funds should be made available to both.

Some of the community colleges are involved in some Regional Occupational Programs as well as in some Manpower Development Training programs, with reference to high school students. There is a feeling of concern that the community college should take a cooperative part in the total program and actually take the lead in providing facilities for Regional Occupational Centers.

The tentative guidelines for Regional Occupational Centers and Programs are being sent to all interested and concerned individuals and groups. The guidelines were prepared under the

aegis of the California State Department of Education, Vocational Education Section.

They are concise and follow the legislation proposed for this activity. Considerable supervision is required at the state level.

The Advisory Council will include an evaluation of the guidelines and criteria in their follow-up study and evaluation of the Regional Occupational Centers, and Regional Occupational Programs.

In general the Regional Occupational Centers report that a significant part (47 percent to 62 percent) of their total enrollments are adult students. The Centers are providing a needed community service.

VIII. Recommendations

As stated in the introduction this report is an assessment of the current situation insofar as the Council was able to determine from the available data. The report then becomes a baseline for future comparison and evaluation. No other specific recommendations are indicated at this time.

APPENDIX A

TENTATIVE

GUIDELINES*

FOR

REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL CENTERS

AND

REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS

*For Discussion Purposes Only

California State Department of Education
Vocational Education Section
January 6, 1971

REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL CENTERS AND REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS

CHAPTER 1

Article 1, General Provisions

00 Scope: The provisions of this chapter apply to all Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs created and maintained under the authority of Chapter 14, California Education Code.

01 Organizational Purpose: The purpose of Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs is to provide a means whereby high quality vocational, technical, and occupational preparation opportunities can be extended through a wider variety of specialized courses and services to serve a larger number of students than can be provided adequately, efficiently, and economically by a single district. It is a further intent to provide high school students and graduates and out-of-school youth and adults, regardless of the geographical location of their residence in a county or region, with the opportunity to enroll in a vocational or technical training program.

02 Instructional Purpose: Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs shall provide vocational, technical, and occupational instruction related to the attainment of skills and knowledges so that the trainees are prepared for:

(a) Gainful employment in the occupational area for which the training was provided, or

(b) Occupational upgrading so that the trainees will have the higher skill levels required by new and changing technology and employment practices, or

(c) Preparation for enrollment in more advanced training programs

03 Definitions:

(a) A Regional Occupational Center is a vocational or technical training program established and maintained pursuant to Chapter 14, commencing with Section 7450 of Division 6 of the Education Code, in a separate, identifiable physical facility.

(b) A Regional Occupational Program is a vocational or technical training program which meets the requirements and standards of instruction in Regional Occupational Centers and which is conducted in a variety of physical facilities not situated in a single location or site.

(c) A course means an instructional unit of an area or field of organized knowledge, usually provided on a semester, year, or prescribed length-of-time basis.

(d) A class means an organized group of pupils within a school who are pursuing a particular course, subject, or activity.

(e) Region means the area of a county or counties which comprise the attendance area of the high school district or districts constituting the membership of a Regional Occupational Center or Regional Occupational Program.

04 Establishment: Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs may be established:

(a) By a County Superintendent of Schools, or with one or more counties with the consent of the State Board of Education.

(b) By two or more school districts maintaining high schools cooperatively with the consent of the County Superintendent of Schools and

the approval of the State Board of Education

(c) By a single district that contains at least 500 schools.

05 Applications for Establishment of Regional Occupational Centers or Regional Occupational Programs: County Superintendents or cooperating school districts desiring to establish a Regional Occupational Center or a Regional Occupational Program shall submit an application to the State Board of Education that includes such detail as to both explain and justify the intended operation, including but not limited to compliance with all requirements in this Chapter and those delineated in Chapter 14 of the California Education Code.

06 Maintenance: Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs shall be maintained in conformity with state statutes, the applicable provisions of Title V, California Administrative Code, and with the provisions of the California State Plan for Vocational Education.

07 Course Approval: The curriculum provided by a Regional Occupational Center or a Regional Occupational Program shall be subject to the approval of the State Department of Education and shall comply with all requirements and standards set forth in the California State Plan for Vocational Education.

08 Criteria for Course Approval: Criteria for differentiating between courses appropriate for Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs and those appropriate for high schools are delineated as follows, with compliance with every criterion required for any course to be construed as being appropriate for inclusion in Regional Occupational Centers or Regional Occupational Programs:

(a) Opportunity for enrollment must be available to qualified students in the region served.

(b) Enrollment must include students from two or more school districts.

(c) The course does not unnecessarily duplicate course offerings already available in the region served.

(d) The course does not unnecessarily duplicate vocational education opportunities offered by community colleges serving the same geographical region.

(e) The course provides training opportunities for a greater number of students than would otherwise be possible.

(f) There is evidence that more efficient and effective use is made of both facilities and personnel than when such course is provided for the students of a single school district.

(g) Opportunity is increased for vocational education services to students regardless of their geographical location or residence.

(h) The supportive resources are increased beyond those available to a single school district.

(i) The course will not unnecessarily reduce or supplant the vocational education efforts of any participating district and shall become an extension or augmentation of vocational education opportunities and enrollments in the participating districts.

(j) No existing class operated by a participating district may be designated as a Regional Occupational Center or Regional Occupational Program course.

<u>09 Counseling and Guidance</u>: A Regional Occupational Center or a Regional

Occupational Program shall provide individual vocational counseling and guidance directly supportive of and contributory to the instructional programs that comprise offerings of the Regional Occupational Center or the Regional Occupational Program.

10 Evaluation: Each Regional Occupational Center or Regional Occupational Program shall submit to the Department of Education in such detail, at such time, and in such manner as the Department of Education deems necessary, an evaluation of the Regional Occupational Center or Regional Occupational Program. This evaluation shall include but not be limited to the following information:

(a) Analysis of the cost of individual centers, programs, and services

(b) Enrollments defined in terms of high school students, post-high school students, and adults

(c) Number of graduates and trainees employed in specific entry-level occupations

(d) Number of graduates and trainees continuing training in other institutions

(e) Dropout rates and placement data

11 Administration: Each Regional Occupational Center or Regional Occupational Program shall be organized and administrated in such manner that there will be a clear and separate audit trail of all income and expenditures, of all agreements and contracts, of enrollments, and of all other statistical information pertaining to fiscal and instructional accountability.

12 Funding Limitations: Financial support of courses and directly attributable

supportive services provided by Regional Occupational Centers and Regional Occupational Programs shall be eligible from resources made available by the provisions of Chapter 14, California Education Code, with the following exceptions:

(a) Whenever students from an outside district are enrolled in an existing regular course of another participating district, financial support will be limited to the students from the outside district.

(b) Under no circumstances shall the funding provisions of Chapter 14, California Education Code, be construed to be general aid for Vocational Education and used as such in making formula-based apportionments to participating districts.

APPENDIX B

REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS AND CENTERS

(COASTAL REGION)

6/30/70

Alameda County

Eden Area
Nick Konnoff
Castro Valley Unified School District
Vocational Education Section
P. O. Box 2146
Castro Valley, California 94546

(415) 537-3000

Fremont-Newark

Dr. Heger
40775 Fremont Blvd.
Fremont, California 94538

(415) 657-1865

Oakland-Emery-Piedmont

Bill Fortman, Coordinator
Oakland Unified School District
1025-2nd Ave.
Oakland California 94606

(415) 836-2622

Contra Costa County

Wilfred McKendry, Coordinator
District Training Program
75 Santa Barbara Road
Pleasant Hill, California 94523

(415) 228-3000

Mendocino County

Phillip Nickerman, Director of Voc.Educ.
Mendocino Regional Occupational Center
589 Low Gap Road
Ukiah, California 95482

(707) 462-4731

Monterey County

Gordon Ray
Salinas-Gonzales Unified School District
431 W. Alisal Street
Salinas, California 93901

(408) 424-0655

Napa County

J. Wilson Bilyeu
Napa Regional Occupational Center
1130 Main Street
Napa, California 94558

(707) 224-3151

Santa Clara County

Roderick Glendenen, Director
San Jose Regional Vocational Center
760 Hillsdale Avenue
San Jose, California 95123

(408) 266-9282

Santa Cruz County

Laurence Edler
Santa Cruz County School District
701 Ocean Street, Room 200
Santa Cruz, California 95060

(408) 425-2243

San Mateo County

Robert Obrey
San Mateo County School District
590 Hamilton Street
Redwood City, California 94063

(415) 369-1411

Sonoma County

"Bud" Loucks
County Administration Center
2555 Mendocino Ave., Room 111E
Santa Rosa, California 95401

(707) 527-2171

REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS AND CENTERS

(CENTRAL REGION)

6/30/70

Glenn County

Herbert Brownlee
Glenn County School Offices
141 So. Lassen Street
Willows, California 95988

(916) 934-5431

Inyo County

Merland F. Despain, Dist. Supv.
Owens Valley Unified Cooperation Prog.
202 S. Clay Street, Box 68
Independence, California 93526

(714) 878-2411

Kern County

Charles E. Wallace
West Side Regional Occupational Center
P. O. Box 1337
Taft, California 93268

(805) 327-2111

Sacramento County

John Moore
Sacramento Regional Center
6011 Folsom Blvd.
Sacramento, California 95819

(916) 454-2821

San Joaquin County

Pat Valladao
Stockton City Unified School District
222 East Weber Street, Room 406
Stockton, California 95202

(209) 944-2241

Stanislaus County

Otis Mercer
Stanislaus County School District
2115 Scenic Drive, P.O. Box 1697
Modesto, California 95354

(209) 524-1251

Tri-County

David Davini, Coordinator
Tri-County Schools
Yuba, Sutter & Colusa
463 Second Street
Yuba City, California 95991

(916) 673-6110

Tulare County

Jack Stinson
Tulare County School Office
202 County Civic Center
Visalia, California 93277

(209) 732-5511

Tuolumne County

Robert Deal
Tuolumne County School District
43 N. Green Street
Sonora, California 95370

(209) 532-7161

REGIONAL OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS AND CENTERS

(SOUTHERN REGION)

Imperial County

Edward E. Fuller, Director
Vocational Education
Imperial Valley County Schools
County Education Center
155 S. 11th Street
El Centro, California 92243

(714) 352-7061

Los Angeles County

Wayne L. Butterbaugh, Director
Southern California Regional Occup. Cent.
2300 Crenshaw Blvd.
Torrance, California 90501

(213) 749-6911

Los Angeles City

George Winder
Los Angeles City Schools
450 N. Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90054

(213) 625-8911

Orange County

Norman Stanger, Dir. of Voc. Educ.
Orange Co. Reg. Occup. Program
1104 W. 8th Street
Santa Ana, California 92701

(714) 834-3900

San Diego County

Lloyd A. Halvin, Cur. Coord.
Vocational-Technical Education
San Diego County Schools
6401 Linda Vista Road
San Diego, California 92111

(714) 278-6400

Ventura County

John L. VanZant, Coordinator
Vocational Education
Ventura County Schools
Courthouse
Ventura, California 93001

(805) 648-6131